

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 94 04:30:22 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #243
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 7 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 243

Today's Topics:

 Positive Postings?
 Re. So. Cal repeaters
 Usefulness of the amateur service

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 7 Jun 94 00:11:26 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!woods.uml.edu!
martinja@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Positive Postings?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Remember when being bitten by the bug meant that you became so enthusiastic
about ham radio you'd do whatever it took to get your license and then do the
same to upgrade in order to obtain more privileges? Remember????

Nowadays it appears people who are bitten by the bug spend most of their time
and scratching and whining and doing whatever it takes to keep from doing
what has to be done to get a license and upgrade. If all that effort was
spent learning the code (ah I don't want to learn code) instead of bitching
about how it is meant to keep thousands of potential hams off the air (bullish)
we'd have a lot more in the ranks of the higher class licenses.

Anymore it seems the electronic media is used to complain about how hard it is
to upgrade or why one should learn something that is outdated and there's no
want to learn it to begin with.

Where on God's green earth does any of this have to do with para 97.1 of Part 97 of the FCC Rules? You know sub-paragraphs (a) thru (e)? Something about recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service, etc. etc.

You can definitely tell the standards have been lowered! Anyone want to help start up a Newsgroup where only positive posting is allowed? Any negative postings will subject the poster to fines and/or imprisonment. Only postings that advance and enhance amateur radio will be permitted. We are training the RF seeking, bomb carrying carrier pigeons now. Coming soon to a shack near you!

I speak for no one, nor for myself for that matter....

Jim/WK1V
Lowell, MA

Date: 6 Jun 1994 16:42:11 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!usenet.cis.ufl.edu!
bennett@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Re. So. Cal repeaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have been following the ongoing discussion over "open vs. closed" repeaters in this and a related group since the first shots were fired. Perhaps it is time to sit back and consider some points.

Both groups have some valid points and concerns (before anyone says anything, I am not and do not condone operation in violation of FCC regs. Instead I am concerned with the long term problem.)

Let me point out the following:

- 1.) A repeater trustee can be held liable for the use to which the repeater is put. It is his/her license, equipment, and financial well-being that is on the line every time someone accesses that repeater. Remember the fuss back during the Gulf war over some packet messages?
- 2.) While there are undoubtedly exceptions, I think it would be a fair rule of thumb to say that the "better" the repeater (i.e. the more the features, greater range, etc) the more the cost to set up and run. Somebody has to pay the bill.
- 3.) Nobody "owns" a frequency.
- 4.) Somebody does "own" and is responsible for the equipment.
- 5.) Some form of co-ordination is going to have to exist. Without co-ordination, there will be a mess.

Personally, I am not all that comfortable with the idea of closing a repeater, but, by the same token, I can understand why an individual, or group of individuals who spend considerable time and effort to set up a piece of

equipment expect the users to help defray the operating costs. I would not, unless there was a bonafide emergency, use a closed repeater where I was not a member, just good manners.

There were a number of suggestions offered, some good, some maybe not so good. I do not think paper repeaters are a good thing, certainly not where there is a shortage of repeater pairs. That is one issue that needs to be addressed, possibly through the repeater application procedure. Maybe a time limit on how long the frequency pair can be assigned without an operational repeater on it. However, consider too that a repeater may be off the air for technical reasons beyond the trustee's control. Someone gave the example of a repeater with a few users being set up as coordinated and then another repeater with a whole lot more users requesting coordination on that pair two months later. Well, I doubt too many coordination bodies have crystal balls.

Now, in regards to the specific 440 squabble. A few points that have not been addressed.

- 1.) As I recall, the amateur service is a "secondary user" of that range of frequencies on a non-interference basis. That means those repeaters could be ordered off those frequencies if interference occurs. Sounds like 440 is not a real good place for open repeaters.
- 2.) One of the original posters made a major tactical error in his post. Never, ever, ever use the word jam or jamming when discussing ones activities. That does tend to wave your basic large, economy size red flag in front of the amateur bull. It does tend to upset people and detracts attention from problems that need to be dealt with. I know the idea of jamming/malicious interference upsets me considerably.
- 3.) Again, applying to the specific case in question, a couple of other posters suggested looking at a different band(1.2GHz as I recall) I do not have my copy of the regs at hand, however I would think looking to greener fields would be a better and more positive use of time and energy. After all, we very badly need to establish use on lightly loaded bands, or else, we are subject to loosing them. I do not know as 1.2GHz would be a good choice, technically speaking. Others more familiar with that band in question would be better able to comment.

Anyway, my two cents worth.

Paul Bennett
N4EGO

My opinions are my own and are totally separate from the organization I work for.

Date: 7 Jun 94 02:48:28 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!

nova!prov7672@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

erik@elvis.umd.umich.edu (Erik Swekel) writes:

>Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
>: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>: > The spectrum is allocated because of our benefit
>: > to the nation, not to support the postal service.

[snip]

>Well, I'm not sure why this point was brought up, but I can say that the
>radio operators here in Wayne Co. Michigan play a very important role with
>NOAA and the local weather services as well. From the "in the field" spotting
>that amateurs provide, the NOAA get vital information that may and has saved
>lives locally and provided weather information that can be applied to the nation
>as a whole. You might say, well "they could just offer an alternative
>arrangement.." Why would they when the amateurs do it for free?

> 73
> unconditionally,
> Erik Swekel N8QLS

As well do we in Genessee County, Michigan, just a bit north of Wayne Co.
While at school, I do participate in the emergency communication nets for
the local Fire Depts., the NOAA weather related nets, and the community
service and disaster drills.

I spent many summers while younger, in Rhode Island, and can say that
the weather there never approaches what we get here in Michigan, with
the odd exception of the hurricane in RI. The same goes as well for my
home in NY. I work with the amateur service there, but the weather need
is not there as it is in MI.

There is a certain amount of interest in the 'hobby' that makes us want
to help in whatever small way that each of us may, "each according to his
abilities...." The sum of the parts does make up the whole. Those that
want an 11 metre box on the 2 metre band are just as eligible to use the
frequencies as anyone else. Just so long as they respect the other uses
and needs of both other operators and of the spectrum.

While I may not be able to create a logical argument that might sway a
doubter to one side of this thread or the other, think for a minute of

the following few things:

- 1) Why did you come into the Amateur Radio Service ('hobby')?
- 2) What did you expect to receive from/give to it?
- 3) What have you given to/received from it?
- 4) Have you benefitted from your involvement in this activity?

If you (a generic to any and all reading this thread) can answer thoughtfully to these questions, think about these answers and look into yourselves.

Think if you have been a 'service' to anyone in your past. If you have, you and your radio ARE a National Service, if only in your small part of the world.

Yes, Mr. Deignan, KD1HZ, I concede that there may be a better way to comprehensively cover on a national scale part of whatever "small service" (my emphasis) we offer. But until such time as that alternative is in place and has an installed base of independent, non-affiliated, non-commercial 'stations' that do not rely on an infrastructure such as this very Internet, Amateur Radio will still have a place.

In debate,

You now have three minutes for cross.

--

```
+-----+-----+-----+
| j d provan   | live for today, because | prov7672       |
| me/ee   n2wnu | tomorrow may never come | @nova.gmi.edu  |
+-----+-----+-----+
```

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 94 00:51:40 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jp1.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-030694103539@145.1.114.19>, <2stdg1\$642@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<CSLE87-060694105004@145.39.1.10>

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Karl Beckman <CSLE87@email.mot.com> writes:

>One more time: 97.101b strictly and explicitly prohibits the assignment of

>any frequency "for the exclusive use of any station." Your membership
>cannot take a vote to suspend this codified federal regulation within the
>state of Texas or anywhere else. It is a condition of the station license
>grant!

Which does mean that TVHFS can't prevent someone from starting an uncoordinated
repeater. It does NOT mean, as far as I know, that a coordinator can be forced
to use special techniques to squeeze in new repeaters against its better
judgement.

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 94 00:47:01 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun6.124354.12073@cs.brown.edu>, <pq60PIR.edellers@delphi.com>,
<1994Jun6.180336.24006@cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> writes:

>If I ask for coordination for a 200-user club, and then a 1,000-user club
>comes along and asks for coordination, are you going to yank mine in
>favor of them, simply because they have more members? That's what you're
>implying.

No, not if your club provides a resource to 3000 other hams who don't belong
by operating an "open" machine, while the bigger club chooses to close theirs.
But if theirs is to be open and yours closed -- or if both are open, but the
new proposal will provide better coverage or more useful features -- then I
do think your group should give way (or make a counterproposal).

>the 2 meter national simplex calling frequency should almost always be
>quiet, except when someone is making a call. Guess we should eliminate
>that one, huh?

No, I don't think ANYONE objects to holding open one simplex channel in a band
for calling purposes. (Anyway, I tend to wonder just how practical it would
be to go beyond the existing repeater segments -- after all the FCC restricts
repeater pairs to 144.5-145.5 and 146-148, and with the need to keep the 600
kHz offset for compatibility I just don't see many opportunities for squeezing
in totally new pairs.)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #243
